

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. No claims stand allowed.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 13 have been amended for further prosecution.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

Objections to Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 is not clearly shown.

Submitted herewith is a set of formal drawings, in which Figure 1 is clearly shown. No changes have been made in the drawings.

With this submission, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In the Office Action, the Examiner specifically alleges that “paragraph 0082 discloses intrinsic evident of carrier wave for ‘a machine-readable medium’. ‘carrier wave’ is being considered as non-statutory subject matter.” Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1-5 have been amended to recite the subject matter of “a computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program.” As recited in claim 1, the instructions of the computer program causes “one or more devices of the home network to perform steps,” and thus the one or more devices of the home network (i.e., “other claimed elements of a computer”) permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In accordance with the MPEP §2106, “computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.” *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035 (emphasis added). Accordingly, claims 1-5 are directed to a statutory subject matter.

In addition, with respect to “carrier wave,” the MPEP §2106 states as follows:

When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement.

When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the MPEP §2106 provides that the “carrier signal” embodying a nonfunctional descriptive material is non-statutory. It should be noted that if a functional descriptive material such as a computer program is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is statutory in accordance with the MPEP §2106. No part of the MPEP §2106 considers “carrier signal” (or carrier wave) as per-se non statutory.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to the claims based §101 on be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki (U.S. Pat. Application No. 2003/0018753), in view of Hummel, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No 6,584,454). The Office Action, the examiner specifically alleges that Seki discloses all of the elements of claim 1 except the graphical user interface allowing the remote user to select only content or services that the remote user is authorized to select, receiving a selection request from the remote user, and providing content or services to the remote user according to the selection request. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

In claim 1, the claimed functions are performed by “one or more devices of the home network” as the claim 1 recites “the instructions for causing one or more devices of the home network to perform steps...” “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Thus, the log-in attempt from a remote user is received at one or more devices of the home network, or more specifically, a gateway of the home network, as shown in

FIG. 1. Similarly, verifying that the remote user is an authorized user of the home network, generating a network address translation rule associating the Internet protocol address with a port of a device on the home network, displaying a graphical user interface to the remote user, receiving a selection request from the remote user, and providing content or services to the remote user according to the selection request are all performed by one or more devices of the home network.

On the other hand, in Seki, when the remote terminal (the alleged remote user) clicks the home-network apparatus identifier 51 (or icon 55), its connection request is transmitted to the proxy server 14 (see [0133] of Seki). That is, Seki's connection request ST409 (the alleged log-in attempt) shown in FIG. 4A is received at the proxy server 14 in the manufacture area 15, not the gateway 10 in the home network area 2, as shown in FIG. 1 of Seki. The manufacture area 15 is an independent network separate from the home network area 2 across the Internet, as clearly illustrate in FIG. 1 of Seki.

Similarly, in Seki, the alleged verification/authentication processes ([0134], [0135], and [0173] of Seki) are all performed by the proxy server 14, not the home gateway 10. In addition, Seki specifically states that "since proxy server 14 is capable of authenticating remote terminals ... and thereby eliminates the need for remote terminals and gateway 10 to perform the authentication..." Accordingly, Seki teaches away from performing authentication of a remote user at the home gateway.

With respect to generating a network address translation rule, Seki describes that the "proxy server 14 generates address conversion information 91 as illustrated in address conversion table 90, line 1 in FIG. 9 ... to register with address conversion information storing section 41 (ST426)" ([0149] of Seki). Thus, in Seki, the address conversion information (the alleged address translation rule) is generated by the proxy server 14, not the gateway 10. Seki's gateway 10 is only refers to the address conversion information storing section 41 ([0162] of Seki), contrary to the claimed invention in which the network address translation rule is generated by a device (home gateway) of the home network. In addition, although Seki states that the "gateway 10 generates address conversion information 92 as illustrated in address conversion table 90, line 2 in FIG. 9" ([0158] of Seki), this information only includes protocol translation (see FIG. 9), and fails to teach or suggest any rules "associating the Internet protocol address with a port of a device on the home network," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Seki

also fails to teach or suggest generating a network address translation rule associating the Internet protocol address with a port of a device on the home network, as recited in claim 1.

The secondary reference Hummel is cited for its policy server 114 which allegedly determines whether the requesting remote system user has access right to the requested software application, and Hummel does not teach or suggest the above mentioned functions performed by the home network as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Seki, whether alone or combines with Hummel, does not teach or suggest any one of (a) receiving the log-in attempt from a remote user, (b) verifying that the remote user is an authorized user of the home network, and (c) generating a network address translation rule associating the Internet protocol address with a port of a device on the home network, among others, all of which are performed by one or more devices of the home network, as recited in claim 1.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Other independent claims 6, 7, 8, 13, and 18 include substantially the same distinctive features as claim 1 as discussed above, among others. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that rejections to the claims based on Seki and Hummel be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12 depend from claim 8, and claims 14-17 depend from claim 13, and thus include all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims, respectively. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, those dependent claims are also patentable at least for the same reasons as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is believed that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Masako Ando/
Masako Ando
Reg. No. 59, 900

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001